Amendment/Response dated: April 21, 2004

Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2003

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 21,

2003. An appropriate Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the

appropriate fee.

Claims 1-16 and 21-24 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In

the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 21-24. Claims 17-19 had been withdrawn. The

present Response cancels claims 17-19, amends claims 1 and 21-24 and add new claims 25-29.

Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

The claims have been amended to among things, include limitations regarding the ribbon coil

configuration. Support is found, for example, paragraph 0032 of the published application.

In the Office Action new drawings were required. The formal drawings are being submitted

herewith. In Figure 1a, the reference number 100 has been added. As indicated in the first sentence of

paragraph 0023, Figure 1a shows an exemplary plasma processing system 100 with a processing chamber

102. The informal drawings did not have the reference number 100. Entry of the formal drawings is

respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the

written description requirement. The Examiner states that the specification does not show or disclose that

the helical electrode is a 3-dimensional helical electrode.

Claims 2-16 and 21-23 were also rejected because they depend on the rejected base claim.

Applicants submit that even though the phrase "3-dimensional" helical electrode was not used, it

is apparent from the drawings of the electrode in Figures 2a, 2b and 2c, for instance, that the

- 8 -

Amendment/Response dated: April 21, 2004

Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2003

configuration is three dimensional in that it is not linear or planer. Nevertheless to expedite prosecution

the phrase "3-dimensional" has been deleted from the claims.

Claims 1 and 21-23, were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ngan, (US

Patent No. 5,919,342).

With respect to claim 1, Ngan is said to disclose an apparatus to perform semiconductor

processing, comprising: a process chamber; a plasma generator for generating a plasma in the process

chamber; and a helical electrode coupled to the output of the plasma generator.

With respect to claims 21-23, Ngan is said to disclose the helical electrode is helical coil,

wherein the spiral turns are similar in size, and has an elongated cross section.

Applicants agree with the Examiner to the extent that the cited reference Ngan discloses a helical

electrode. However, as shown in Figure 2, the helical coil 186 which has a circular cross section. (See

column 1, line 44). In contrast the claimed invention employs a helical ribbon electrode where the coil

has a width that is greater than its thickness or has an elongated cross section.

Claims 2-9, 12-16 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ngan,

and in view of Qian et al. (US Patent No. 6,447,636).

With respect to claims 1 and 24, Ngan, is said to disclose a multi-layer processing chamber,

comprising a gas source coupled to the chamber for introducing a processing gas into a reaction chamber

having a sample disposed therein; a solid state RF plasma source coupled to the chamber to excite the

processing gas; and a helical electrode adapted to excite the plasma.

The Examiner concedes that Ngan does not clearly teach a controller coupled to the RF plasma to

pulse the RF plasma source for each deposited layer.

-9-

Amendment/Response dated: April 21, 2004

Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2003

However, Qian et al. is said to disclose a system controller coupled to the solid state RF plasma

source to pulse the solid state RF plasma source 105 for each deposited layer. The Examiner concluded

that it would have been obvious to combine the controller teaching of Qian et al. with Ngan's plasma

chamber, because it would have improved the characteristic, such as uniformity of the deposited layer as

taught by Qian et al.

Applicants admit that even if the secondary reference Qian et al. teaches the art as suggested by

the Examiner, the reference nevertheless does not cure the deficiencies of Ngan. As shown in Figure 1,

the semiconductor wafer processing system includes an antenna 102 that is a multiple concentric spiral

coil having windings which conform to the shape of the dome. (See column 3, lines 65-67). As is

apparent, the antenna coils have circular cross sections

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ngan, and Qian

et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ishizuka et al.

The Examiner concludes that Ngan does not disclose wherein the distance between the helical

electrode and a workpiece is less than five inches. However, the Examiner states that Ishizuka et al.

discloses an apparatus that is adapted to receive a workpiece W in the chamber 1 and wherein the distance

between the coil electrode 13 and the workpiece W is less than five inches.

Finally, Applicants submit that even if Ishizuka et al. teach the art as suggested by the Examiner,

this reference nevertheless does not cure the deficiencies of Ngan. As shown in Figure 2 and described at

column 6, line 61 etc., the reference employs an electrode 13 that is a coil which is in the form of a plane

spiral extending parallel to the wafer mount. Again, the coil has a circular cross section which is different

from the claimed ribbon electrode.

- 10 -

Amendment/Response dated: April 21, 2004

Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2003

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject

patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is

respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a

patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending

the time to respond up to and including today, April 20, 2004.

- 11 -

Amendment/Response dated: April 21, 2004

Reply to OA dated: October 21, 2003

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for

extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 04

Charles H

Reg. No. 34,192

FLIESLER MEYER LLP

Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4156

Telephone: (415) 362-3800